DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 381 817 CS 508 873

AUTHOR Driskill, Gerald W.; Polansky, Brian
TITLE Relinquishing Power in the Classroom: A Case Study on Self-Directed Teams in the Classroom.
PUB DATE Nov 94
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (80th, New Orleans, LA, November 19-22, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Classroom Environment; Communication Skills; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation; Instructional Innovation; *Organizational Communication; Power Structure; Student Attitudes; *Student Centered Curriculum; *Student Educational Objectives; *Student Needs; Teamwork
IDENTIFIERS *Metacommunication

ABSTRACT

The shift toward self-directed work teams in organizations is well documented and is further underscored by models that give teamwork an integral role in accomplishing organizational goals. The traditional classroom fails to mirror such shifts when it emphasizes instructor control and decision making with a premium placed on clarity in direction, assignments, and evaluations. A study in an organizational communication classroom therefore attempted to empower students by placing them in teams charged with determining course mission, goals, structure, policies, and procedures. The major phases of this effort were as follows: (1) the distribution of a packet used to initiate the organizing process; (2) the creation and use of work teams; (3) the setting of class objectives; (4) devising a means of assessment; (5) developing a set of tasks to be researched by the various teams. In conclusion, the self-directed team approach provided a rich experiential learning environment. It fostered a mutual dependency that mirrors real life; it offered numerous opportunities for metacommunication--times when class members openly discussed their feelings about the self-directed approach; it challenged the instructor to look critically at traditional classroom setups; and it empowered students to devise their own teaching/training strategies. Shortcomings of the project were that it exposed students to only a limited number of topics and works of literature in the field and that the quality of work produced by students suffered. (Contains 15 references and five appendixes of evaluation sheets, and assessment and survey items and scores.) (TB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 381 817

Relinquishing Power in the Classroom:
A Case Study on Self-Directed Teams in the Classroom

Gerald W. Driskill

Brian Polansky

Speech Communication Department

University of Arkansas-Little Rock

2801 S. University

Little Rock, AR 72204

501-569-3158

GWDRISKILL@UALR.EDU

CS 508873

RUNNING HEAD: Relinguishing Power

Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association, New Orleans, LA, November, 1994.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Driskill

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This paper describes an effort to empower students by placing them in teams charged with determining course mission, goals, structure, policies, and procedures. The paper reports the major phases of this effort by discussing: (a) the "creativity and constraints" packet used to begin the class, (b) the evolution of temporary and goal teams, and (c) the instructor facilitated interventions used to encourage student "processing" of their experiences of organizing.

The paper describes the rich data collected through (a) a survey revealing the divergent views of the classroom culture and (b) a communication audit of information flow, conflict management, and motivation practices which yielded differing perceptions of the effectiveness of team communication. These insights are discussed in light of the trade-offs involved in relinquishing power in the classroom.

Relinquishing Power in the Classroom:

A Case Study on Self-Directed Teams in the Classroom

"It's like a haunted house, a bit scary but also fun."

"It's like a dictatorship masquerading as a democracy."

These two quotes reveal the diverse perceptions of two students in an upper level organizational communication class that utilized a self-directed teams approach. These comments were taken from a class exercise that sought student perceptions at one point several weeks into the semester and reflect the challenge placed before students and teachers engaged in using self-directed teams in the classroom.

The use of self-directed teams continues to be of interest in organizational development efforts (Gavin & McPhail, 1978; Kilmann, 1984; Lowenberg, 1985; Sashkin & Burke, 1987; Scherer, 1979). This approach represents a major investment of resources and considerable commitment from all involved. This commitment is perhaps most noticeable in the communication demands placed on organizational members. Beyond the potential need to manage higher levels of ambiguity related to such things as work expectations and evaluation processes, there are also greater interpersonal communication skill demands (Critchley & Casey, 1984; Gribas & Driskill, 1989).

The shift toward self-directed work teams in organizations is well documented (Galagan, 1988; Larson & LaFasto, 1989; George, 1977; Howe, 1977; Poza & Markus, 1980) and is further underscored by models that give teamwork an integral role in accomplishing

organizational goals (Blake, Mouton, & Allen, 1987; Likert, 1961; Peters & Waterman, 1982). The traditional class room, however, fails to mirror such shifts when it emphasizes instructor control and decision making with a premium placed on clarity in direction, assignments and evaluation. This form of organizing seems inconsistent with trends in many organizations. This paper describes an effort to empower students by placing them in teams charged with determining course mission, goals, structure, policies, and procedures. This case study analysis reports the major phases of this effort by discussing: (a) the packet used to initiate the organizing process, (b) the creation and use of work teams, (c) the interventions used to encourage student "processing" of their teamwork, and (d) summary insights gleaned from this approach.

Organizing the Class

The Packet

After "ditching" the traditional syllabus, a "creativity and constraints" packet was developed to initiate the organizing process. Based on the sub-title of Eisenberg and Goodall's (1993) text, this packet was used to introduce the students to the course as well as basic guidelines. These guidelines included general "constraints" that would guide work during the semester while encouraging "creative" ownership of major components of the class. The major elements of this packet included:

1. Syllabus/Class Policies
2. Tentative Course Schedule
3. Goal setting Assignment

4. Developing Requirements Assignment
5. Developing Assessment Instrument Assignment
6. Additional Resources

The three assignments used to begin the semester are discussed next in order to depict the way the course utilized the creativity and constraints packet.

Setting Class Objectives

The objective of the first assignment was to improve student's goal setting and negotiation skills. This assignment, like all assignments used during the semester, contained two sets of criterion. The "Constraints" were developed by considering exigencies in the larger university and academic environment (e.g., the course description in the university bulletin), time limits (e.g., a limit on the number of goals that could be reached in a semester), and the need to appraise individual performance for grading purposes (e.g., the need for each person to turn in a "goals work sheet" in order to maintain equity across the class).

"Creativity" criteria included suggestions or examples of areas that could be explored within the constraints. These were intended to remind students that constraints did not keep them from exploring new areas. They were reminded that such constraints like the course description left much room for creativity--a process usually left in the hands of the professor. For example, they were told that course objectives could reflect their "curiosities, questions, and learning ambitions."

The "Objective or Goal Setting" assignment was turned in during the first week. Students were given evaluation sheet in advance to remind them of the grading criteria (Appendix A). For example, they could write in something they did to develop their list of objectives or check one of the suggested items like "Asking professionals whose expertise you trust".

The objectives devised by the students were used to create a master list. These were discussed by the class with advocates of certain objectives were given opportunity to voice their ideas more fully. Certain objectives were combined and others eliminated based on discussion. Finally, the class agreed on a statement of four objectives. These four objectives were placed into the following statement:

> At semester's end each member of our organization should have developed theoretic and applied insights in the following areas of organizational communication: (a) socialization process and cultural assumptions that influence our communication within the organization, (b) conflict management, (c) communication and the regulation or motivation of behavior, and (d) information management.

The process of developing the final set of objectives took the first week and half of class. The next stage was to devise requirements or assignments to reach these objectives.

Developing Requirements

Prior to involving the class in making a final determination in the best way to reach course objectives, time was given to training them in devising assignments. The objective of this activity was to improve individual their ability to create methods for reaching specific objectives. This assignment also included specific criteria based on constraints (e.g., "the assignment must include some type of evaluation/test of knowledge and skills that has an individual component"). and creativity (e.g., "assignments can include stages or phases for completion"). A final evaluation sheet was provided that summarized these criteria. Then each class member devised two assignments related to course objectives. They were given control over the objective and encouraged to be creative in the process. Students were required to revise their assignment until it reached these basic criteria.

A second step in devising assignments involved temporary "goal" teams evolved from class room discussion. Temporary teams were created because class members felt they needed more input and interaction in improving their "practice" assignments. Four teams were charged with devising one "best" assignment for reaching each of the four course objectives. This second step resulted in more synergestic efforts in creating assignments that might be used during the semester.

Devising a Pre-Assessment

A third introductory assignment was that of devising an assessment instrument. The objective of this assignment was to help students define specific cognitive, behavioral and affective

criterion on which to assess themselves at the beginning and end of the semester. A final version of this instrument was created from student input and used to focus on course objectives (Appendix B). For example, with regard to the conflict management, student's assessed themselves as to their level of knowledge of conflict management, their skills in managing conflicts, and finally their commitment to applying effective conflict management strategies in organizations. An analysis of these pre and post test is provided later in the paper.

Creating Work Teams

After students had turned in individual assignments on setting objectives, developed "practice" assignments for course objectives individually and in temporary teams, and completed the self-assessments, class time was devoted to determining methods for reaching course objectives. The class made the decision to charge four different teams with using two weeks of the semester to guide the entire class toward one of the four goals. The temporary teams, became permanent teams.

Three decisions were made in conjunction with getting these teams started. First, a decision was made to randomly assign the objectives to these permanent teams. This was done to encourage greater class synergy concerning assignment development. Thus, rather than allow the temporary teams to keep their original assignment and objective, each team was given a new objective along with the assignment idea that the temporary team had created. Second, time frames had to be determined. The class decided that

two weeks time frames should be given to each team. The team would have the freedom to use this time in whatever way the believed would best met their assigned objective. Finally, the order of these two week blocks was determined through another random selection that resulted in the following sequence of course objectives: (1) Organizational Culture, (2) Conflict Management, (3) Communication and Motivation, and (4) Information Exchange.

A revised course syllabus reflected these assigned two week time blocks but also included process days between the blocks. These process days are discussed in the next section.

Processing the Process

Uncertainty ran high during the first weeks of the semester. Assurances were repeated that assignments could be revised and that their grade in the class was to be determined by their willingness to respond to feedback and make required revisions. The time spent on providing such assurances evolved into scheduled days for processing--for metacommunication on the course. The following section highlights two instances of student instigated metacommunication, specifically (1) an emergent organizational rule and (2) a call for a formal mission statement. In addition, the instructor instigated (3) an analysis of the organizational culture and (4) an audit of their perceptions of communication by the teams. These process days proved invaluable.

Identifying an Emergent Rule

The first day scheduled for teams to work on their assigned goals resulted in a conflict. A student asked whether or not each

team had to use the assignment given to them by the temporary teams. Several in the class realized the possible conflict created as this question suggested that the assignment that group had been given was not up to "their" standards. An underlying tension was evident as we began to discuss the possible ramifications if a goal team rejected the use of the assignments created by a temporary team. Some of the underlying questions included: (a) Would this rejection reflect poorly on anyone's grade? (b) Would this rejection create difficult working relationships when they gave the new assignment? (c) Why should a goal team be stuck with an assignment they felt was incomplete or unclear? In short, they began to ask how they could manage this conflict in personal versus task communication challenges.

A new organizational practice and consequent rule emerged. In order to clarify the assignments provided by the temporary teams, liaisons were assigned from each team to provide additional explanation. Furthermore, since the permanent teams were ultimately responsible for the assignments they gave to the class, the class decided that they had the freedom to use, change, or ignore the assignment handed on to them. The need to discuss and devise this rule proved to be only one of many discussions and interventions related to the process of organizing.

The Mission

As the "Organizational Culture" goal team begin its work on helping the class understand the notion of organizational culture and its implications for communication, it became clear that the

class desired a clearer focus on how the four goals fit the larger mission of the course. One process day was used to gather "mission statements" from members. An adhoc team was created to examine these statements and then to propose two or three options for the class to adopt. The final version was:

> We are an organization of students who have come together for the shared purpose of learning the dynamics of organizatinal communication. As an organization we are discovering how to balance the use of creativity and constraint, how to formulate concrete ideas out of ambiguous concepts, and how to work toward a goal collectively within a group as well as individually.

This formally adopted mission statement, however, was far from capturing the diversity of perceptions of what this "organization" was really about.

The Culture

At about the 5 week mark in a 15 week semester, students were asked to write down a metaphor or a brief statement that captured their perceptions of the course. The richness and diversity of their responses resulted in a full class period that focused on both of the value of gaining such information in an organization as well as the implications of their comments for our work together. Three major areas were discussed.

1. A list of emergent rules and roles were listed. For example, it had become clear that the instructor's role included

such duties as providing "creativity and constraint" criterion as well as facilitating process days.

2. Six major metaphors were discussed. Three of the more intriguing metaphors that represent the diversity of perceptions included:

"Still thirsty after drinking a gallon of water." This idea referred to doing lots of work but not really feeling like their learning expectations were being meet.

"A masquerading dictatorship." This metaphor was shared by students who felt constrained by the instructor's final say on grades. Several students had previous experience in self-directed teams in other classes in which the teacher provided fewer constraints on grades.

"A haunted house." Adjectives used to describe the course included such phrases as "fun and scary" and "lost but ok." These students had mixed feelings, but seemed to be enjoying the process.

3. Finally, assumptions about the nature of organizations implied in some of the metaphors were discussed. For example, Weick's ideas on organizing (c.f., Eisenberg & Goodall, 1993) were discussed in conjunction with the role of ambiguity in the process of organizing and the importance of developing the skills of managing ambiguity.

The Audit

The tentative syllabus had included a list of possible topics that might be covered if time allowed. Several students desired to learn more about the audit process so the end of the semester was

devoted to a communication audit of the class. This audit was not designed to be comprehensive or measure perceptions related to every aspect of communication at all levels (e.g., interpersonal, group, and organization). Instead, surveys were designed with two goals in mind: (a) First, it was hoped that introducing them to the audit process would illustrate the value of an audit. (b) Second, the audit provided a basis for processing communcation related to information management, conflict management, and motivational communication used by the teams during the semester. These three topics were selected because they had not received focused attention as had the topic of organizational culture.

Information Flow. Based on the goal group's presentation of this topic, the instructor devised a survey with items related to student perceptions of information flow related to assignments given by each goal group. Four areas were examined: (1) information sources; (2) messages; (3) channels/media; and (4) receivers. Appendix C contains survey items with mean data organized by team along with general cautions given to the class for interpreting data. A guide sheet for discussion was prepared that explored three general trends from the analysis: (1) General agreement that information management was effective, (2) Different perceptions across teams, and (3) Perceived problems in information exchange.

The discussion concerning these findings yielded valuable insights. For example, one perceived problem was that the conflict team had a higher mean score (x=3.2) on item #1 indicating that the

class felt there were competing sources of information regarding the assignments this team gave. An explanation for this source competition was discussed in light of the way this team provided directions that allowed more room for creativity. The class discussed the tendency for members of this team to interpret these "creative" directions differently and to provide informal advice to students outside of class on how to complete assignments. This discussion resulted in valuable insights concerning the additional challenges placed on communicators when managing creative or ambiguous messages.

Conflict Management. Whereas the survey on information flow examined differences by teams, the conflict survey focused on overall class perceptions. Appendix D contains the survey along with mean data. Three summary observations were made and discussed: (1) Students tended to agree with one another on three of the items: #1 "Conflicts are managed at appropriate levels;" #2 "Appropriate levels of threat are maintained;" and #7 "I adopted appropriate strategies for managing conflicts." (2) The class was split in the perceptions of the other four items. For example, four of the nine students agreed that "conflicts were identified before they got out of hand," whereas the other five disagreed. (3) Finally, the need to explore the reasons for differing perceptions was highlighted. Class discussion made it clear that such survey data merited follow-up interviews in order to determine reasons for these differing perceptions. These diverse perceptions

made it clear that caution should be taken in assuming we share the same organizational reality.

Motivation. The motivation survey also focused on overall perceptions of the class (Appendix E). Similar to the conflict survey: (1) Areas of agreement were noted (e.g., #2 "Goals were sufficiently challenging to motivate me;" #5 "Assignments appealed to members with differing motivational patterns"). (2) Areas of disagreement were explored and showed that the class was split in their perceptions of such basic issues as whether or not "expected behaviors" were clearly identified (#1) and whether or not "constructive levels of job satisfaction were maintained" (#4). (3) These differences indicated the diverse way members experience the same organization. Furthermore, we discussed the way a network analysis, if time allowed, might identify cliques that shared similar perceptions.

Conclusions

This case study of self-directed teams in the classroom provided five conclusions that reveal strengths, limits, as well as suggestions for future applications of this approach. These insights are suggestive of the trade-offs involved in relinquishing power in the classroom.

Strengths

The self-directed team approach provided a rich experiential learning environment. Four specific advantages of this approach over traditional approaches were noticed. First, the way their mutual dependency on each other to accomplish tasks mirrored life

in other organizations. For example, the audit results showed the extent to which students perceived their dependency on classmates for information for assignments.

Second, an almost limitless number of experiences occurred that encouraged metacommunication. The survey and culture audit were only two formal means used to process the communication process. Outside of class, a high degree of interaction occurred as students sought assistance in understanding the "chaos". Discussions outside of the class dealt with such pragmatics as:

> (a) organizational politics--"how to deal with this class" since I came to school to "get away" from the politics of work; (b) diversity--"what to do about" the team members who seem to assume I can not do my work just because I am an international student"; (c) perceived laziness--"You might as well know it, some of these guys are just looking to get out with as little work as possible"; and (d) uncertainty reduction--"well, I do not see our team as knowing much about this topic, what are we to do?"

These issues and others allowed for a plethora of "teachable" moments that are not as frequently found when using a traditional approach.

Third, this approach challenges instructors to examine traditional class objectives and methods in terms of student retention. The traditional class has usually favored content over application or experiential demands. This team based approach

clearly favored experiential learning in that a great deal of organizational communication theory/concepts were sacrificed. Students would probably not pass final exams given in many organizational communication classes due to this sacrifice. However, beyond the four major topics covered, it is likely that the concepts that surfaced through our naturally occurring metacommunication resulted in greater retention. The pre and post test evaluations of student perceived learning indicated signicant changes. The use of comparison groups as well as post assessments given at later intervals would have provided a more valid evaluation of this claim of greater retention.

Fourth, students were empowered to devise their own teaching/training strategies that often went beyond what most instructors would consider. For example, three high quality guest speakers were used in the class that the instructor would have never considered tapping as resources. Furthermore, movies never seen by the instructor were utilized as case study material. In addition, students made their way to other faculty members to gain resources for the class.

Limitations

Two limitation were noticed. First, it was concluded that the actual exposure to various topics and literature in the field of organizational communication was limited. As already indicated in the discussion of balancing content/application demands, this course covered fewer concept than traditionally covered. The

textbook was rarely utilized by the students since it was not a requirement or "constraint" placed on the teams. Furthermore, the students had not had previous organizational communication classes and therefore where often at a loss on what to provide the class during the two weeks they were charged with "teaching". Thus, while they were innovative, at times the content reflected "warmed over" material from other classes they had completed. A contributing factor to the reduced amount of content was the hesitation to require work from peers. For example, even though each team provided content in lecture form and in some cases required students to integrate at least one other source in their out of class assignments, they rarely required students to delve into the text or research articles.

Second, and related to the previous conclusion, the quality of the work produced by the majority of the students tended to suffer. This observation is based on an overall sense that more average or below average assignments were turned in during the semester than usual. There are several plausible explanations for this lower level of quality including (a) the limited training provided in creating assignments; (b) students would not always believe that the criteria given by their peers would actually be used to grade papers; and (c) the tendency for peers to not want to provide challenging work for "fear" that the next team would get "revenge".

Suggestions for improving team based approaches

Three suggestions for team based approaches are clear. First, additional time was needed for "processing the process." Like other organizations, the tendency to cut short processing time and needful metacommunication occurred during the semester. The pedagogical strength of the self-directed team approach was the experiential nature of the course. Students who grasped this focus early in the semester tended to relax and enjoy the change of pace. They also tended to pick out relevant features and make efforts to apply them to their interactions. For example, students who recognized that the material on conflict management was intended to assist them in their work with their teams, were the same students who expressed appreciation for the non-traditional approach. For others, intergroup conflicts only frustrated them and prompted them to feel they were not getting anything out of the class.

These differences between student responses to the class merited further attention during class time. The data gathered in the surveys and through informal visits with students should have been given additional class discussion time. A future version of this class might limit the number of goals even further and schedule larger blocks of time and assignments related to processing.

A second way to improve the use of teams would be to provide time for a discussion of power and control in the classroom. As indicated in the culture survey, there were students who felt the instructor was a dictator who wore a "mask of democracy". Thus, despite the creation of a packet that indicated constraints as well

as areas they could be creative, there was not a clearly defined sense of "how far" they could go. Thus, future classes might consider a first week spent on organizations/classes as political entities. This discussion could provide a vocabulary for discussing control and power issues throughout the semester.

A final suggestion is for a initial training in working in teams. Team building theorists and researchers are in general agreement that teams differ with regard to the types of communication skills that will be needed for team success (Critchley & Casey, 1984; Gribas & Driskill, 1989). In this setting, the high degree of creative decision making, the equal power base of the team members, combined with time constraints, indicate that students may have benefitted from having as a prerequisite course that developed group communication skills or some type of team based training early in the semester.

Summary

Teamwork has long been recognized as an integral role in accomplishing organizational goals (Blake, Mouton, & Allen, 1987; Likert, 1961; Peters & Waterman, 1982). Many professional organizations have successfully integrated self-directed work teams into their organizational practices (Galagan, 1988; Larson & LaFasto, 1989; George, 1977; Howe, 1977; Poza & Markus, 1980).

The traditional class room, however, fails to reflect these trends toward empowerment and voice. The university classroom generally places emphasis on instructor control and decision making

with a premium placed on clarity in direction, assignments and evaluation.

This paper described an effort to empower students by placing them in teams charged with determining course mission, goals, structure, policies, and procedures. The paper reports the major phases of this effort by discussing: (a) the "creativity and constraints" packet used to begin the class, (b) the evolution of temporary and goal teams, and (c) the instructor facilitated interventions used to encourage student "processing" of their experiences of organizing.

The paper described the data collected through (a) a survey revealing the divergent views of the classroom culture and (b) a communication audit of information flow, conflict management, and motivation practices which yielded differing perceptions of the effectiveness of team communication. These insights were discussed in light of the trade-offs involved in relinquishing power in the classroom.

Appendix A

EVALUATION SHEET FOR DEVELOPING OBJECTIVES

(Point Sheet)

Place a mark by the Constraints that you followed:

___ 1. Reflects at least one of the following major topic areas:

a. Basic theories of organizational communication

b. Socialization, stress, ethical issues

c. Relational skills (including intercultural comm.)

d. Effective organizational communciation

e. Assessing communication in organizations

___ 2. Reflect specific measurable behaviors

___ 3. No fewer than 2 and no more than 5 goals

___ 4. No duplication of the goals of another class

___ 5. Able to match with a method(s) for reaching the goal

___ 6. Does not focus on technical business writing

Place a mark by the Creativity criteria you used:

___ 1. Taps broad nature (ambiguity) of course topic

___ 2. Reflects your curiosities, questions, & learning goals ___

3. Refers to the text and select areas of particular interest

___ 4. Asked professionals whose expertise you trust

___ 6. Other: _____

Appendix B
FIRST ASSESSMENT: ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION

Directions: Complete the following by circling the number that best describes your current level of knowledge, skill, and commitment on each of the following items.

As I BEGIN this course I would describe my KNOWLEDGE of . . .	Highly Developed		Moderately developed		Needing Development
1. how to define and apply org. comm. as	1	2	3	4	5
2. major theories & approaches to org. comm. as	1	2	3	4	5
3. ethical issues related to comm. in organizations as	1	2	3	4	5
4. the importance of organizational culture as	1	2	3	4	5
5. effective conflict management strategies in organizations as	1	2	3	4	5
6. effective use of comm. for motivating self/others in organizations as	1	2	3	4	5
7. effective information exchange practices in organizations as	1	2	3	4	5
8. interventions to facilitate organizational comm. effectiveness as	1	2	3	4	5
As I begin this course I would describe my SKILLS in...					
1. providing explanations of what you can do with a background in organizational comm. as	1	2	3	4	5
2. determining the culture of an organization as	1	2	3	4	5
3. identifying effective conflict management practices in an organization as	1	2	3	4	5
4. identifying motivational patterns of members of an organization as	1	2	3	4	5
5. determining effective information management practices in org. as	1	2	3	4	5
As I begin this course I would describe my COMMITMENT TO ...					
1. serving as a model of competent org. communication as	1	2	3	4	5
2. using information about org. culture in the socialization process as	1	2	3	4	5
3. using conflict for productive outcomes as	1	2	3	4	5
4. adapting my comm. strategies to fit the motivational patterns of org. members as	1	2	3	4	5
5. improving the information management practices in organizations as	1	2	3	4	5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix C
Information Management Analysis
Survey items, Means Scores, & Interpretation Guides

*NOTE: Lower means indicate stronger agreement.

Information Sources & Assignments	CULT	CONFL	MOTIV	INFO
1. There were (NOT) competing sources of information.	2.6	3.2	2.1	2.4
2. Information sources(did not)rely on one-way.	2.2	2.2	1.7	2.4
Information Messages & Assignments				
3. There was sufficient direction to accomplish tasks.	2.0	1.8	1.8	2.2
4. Directions provided sufficient room for creativity.	2.0	1.4	1.6	1.9
Information Channels/media & Assignments				
5. There was a sufficient balance between oral and written forms of information	2.1	1.7	1.8	2.0
6. The most effective types of media were used to convey information.	2.4	2.1	1.7	2.4
Information Receivers & Assignments				
7. I had sufficient trust in sources of information.	2.0	1.9	2.0	1.8
8. Information was consistent with our class/ org. culture concerning effective assignments.	2.0	1.9	2.0	2.0
9. Information was consistent with my beliefs about effective class assignments.	2.0	1.9	1.5	2.0
10. I took sufficient initiative/responsibility to gain clarity on assignments.	2.1	1.7	2.1	2.0
11. My lack of confidence in being able to effectively complete assignments influenced the way I interpreted directions	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.0

Summary Cautions in Interpretation

1. Caution in using mean data in that it may not reflect diversity. Check frequency data.
2. Small sample, especially with 2 absences from 1 team, may influence result.
3. Self-serving bias may influence results.
4. Primacy/Recency effect may influence results

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix D

Conflict Management Analysis
Survey Items & Mean Scores

	SA	A	D	SD	X
1. Conflicts were managed at appropriate levels.	1	7	2	1	2.4
2. Appropriate levels of threat were maintained.	1	7	2	0	2.1
3. Norms and rules for communication roles were clear.	1	5	3	1	2.4
4. Conflicts were identified before they got out of hand.	0	4	5	1	2.7
5. There was sufficient mutual dependency to motivate productive conflict.	0	5	5	0	2.5
6. I made an effort to adapt to the motivational pattern of org. members during conflict.	1	6	3	0	2.2
7. I adopted appropriate strategies for managing conflicts.	1	9	0	0	1.9

Appendix E

Motivation/Communication Analysis
Survey Items & Mean Scores

	SA	A	D	SD	X
1. Expected behaviors were clearly identified.	0	4	6	0	2.6
2. Goals were sufficiently challenging to motivate me.	4	5	1	0	1.7
3. Rules were consistent for motivating behaviors from team to team.	0	6	4	0	2.4
4. Constructive levels of job satisfaction helped maintain sufficient levels of motivation.	0	5	5	0	2.5
5. Assignments appealed to org. members with differing motivational patterns.	2	6	2	0	2.0

References

Blake, R., Mouton, J., & Allen, R. (1987). Spectacular teamwork. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Critchley, B., & Casey, D. (1984). Second thoughts on team building. Management Education and Development, 15(2), 163-175.

Galagan, P. (1988). Donald E. Peterson: Chairman of Ford and champion of its people. Training and development journal, 42, 20-24.

Gavin, J. & McPhail, S. (1978). Intervention and evaluation: A proactive team approach to OD. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 14, 175-194.

George, William W. (1977). Task teams for rapid growth. Harvard Business Review,55(2), 71-80.

Gribas, J., & Driskill, G. (1989). Team building variables: Implications for theory, research, and intervention. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Conference, San Francisco, CA.

Howe, Roger J. (1977). Building teams for increased productivity. Personnel Journal, 56, 16-22.

Kilmann, R.H. (1984). Beyond the quick fix: Managing five tracks to organizational success. San Francisco: Bass.

Larson, C. & LaFasto, F. (1989). Teamwork: What must go right/what can go wrong. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Likert, R. (1961). New patterns of management, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lowenberg, R. (1985). Problem-solving teams: Building a healthier organization. The Police Chief, 52, 55-58.

Peters, T. & Waterman, R. (1982). In search of excellence. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Poza, E. & Markus, M (1980). Success story: The team approach to work restructuring. Organizational Dynamics, pp. 3-24.

Sashkin, M. & Burke, W. (1987). Organization development in the 1980's. Journal of Management, 13, 393-417.

Scherer, J. (1979). Can team building increase productivity? Or how can something that feels so good not be worthwhile? Group & Organizational Studies, 4, 335-351.